

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	T	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/040,920		12/28/2001	Juan G. Revilla	10559-566001 P12728	3816	
20985	7590	05/05/2004		EXAMINER		
FISH & RI			THAI, TUAN V			
	AMINO REAL D. CA 92130-2081		·-	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,	,		2186	- 11	
				DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	a
Advisory Action	10/040,920	REVILLA ET AL.	
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan V. Thai	2186	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address -	-
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to ch places the application	ı in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension the final Office action; or (2) as	fee under set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	•
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simpli	fying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	tion(s)·		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	· · · ———	eparate, timely filed ame	endment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT pla	ace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.		to issues which were ne	wly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • • • • •	,	an .
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:	·		
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•		
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>			

Continuation of 10. Other: The requests for reconsideration has been considered, however they are not deemed to be persuasive. Examiner would like to reemphasize that Arimilli does in fact disclose the concept of accessing the local addressable memory in which it is equivalent to or embedded within the polling operation that results to cache hit or local memory hit; for example, in making the access request to the local addressable memory (L1) which results to MISS, the request is forwarded to L2 cache memory; however, if the requested data is present in the L1 cache after polling operation, the requested data or memory block would be accessed and retrieved. In addition, as detailed in the previous office action, Arimilli discloses the coherency protoccol (column 3, lines 23-42) which is known to comprise the concept of routing of the request to one of a local addressable memory and local cache in response to the a local descriptor state; since, in order to maintain data consistency, the request must be routed to the location contains the most up-to-date data, or the modified data.

/ TUAN V. THAI (